Panel Discussion (contd); TPO-0026

	•
1	but it's going to effect the whole nation. And
2	it's going to effect the industry, it's going
3	to effect everything.
4	So I think it would be a good thing
5	for Move-On. And I thank you for those
6	comments that you made through Gerry, Mike.
7	MR. MICHAEL COLLINS: It was my
8	pleasure.
9	MS. PAIGE KNIGHT: No, I don't
10	want to get you in trouble.
11	MR. GERRY POLLET: Mike had
12	nothing to do with that.
13	MR. DEE WILLIS: We've got
14	another questions back here.
15	MS. PAIGE KNIGHT: Do you want
16	to make some comments for Gerry, Mike?
17	MR. DEE WILLIS: We've got a
18	questioner back here. We'll come to you later.
19	Name, sir?
20	TPO-0026 MR. TIM STEARNS: Good evening,
21	my name is Tim Stearns. I live in Seattle.
22	And it strikes me that we continue
23	to have a crisis of trust here. And I guess
24	I'd be interested in comments on how we work
25	through it.
	142
	142

TPO-0026 (contd)

It's fairly clear we don't have 2 modeling that we really can understand the 3 risks that we're dealing with. It's fairly clear that we don't really have a clear and comprehensive plan of how we're going to deal with the waste across the set of complexes. We have transportation risks, but it's really not clear how we would manage them. We were just in Seattle yesterday where we 10 tested the dirty bomb scenario. And it wasn't 11 12 pretty. I mean, essentially all of the 13 rescue workers, the initial responders were 14 contaminated. This is one we planned. And 15 what do we do when we come to other ones? 16 And I guess, you know, as a range of 17 questions or a final range of a question of, 18 you know, this EIS really doesn't contemplate 19 anything but an import action. 20 It doesn't really look at treating 21 waste really anyplace other than Hanford. It doesn't really consider treating it at a place that actually has adequate facilities, licensed in-place facilities in place before we start 25

143

TPO-0026 (contd); Panel Discussion (contd)

moving stuff. 1 And finally, there's no real consideration of trying to do this in a place that doesn't already have contaminated groundwater and a contaminated river. 6 So I guess I'm interested in your 7 thoughts. How we bring trust back to this situation between the citizens of the Northwest 8 and the Department of Energy and the Bush 9 administration. Thank you. 10 MR. DOUG HUSTON: Well, I think 11 I'll start off with this. 12 13 MR. DEE WILLIS: Wait a minute. I just want to mark the fact that there are 14 several comments imbedded in his question. 15 Tim Stearns? 16 MR. TIM STEARNS: Yes. 17 MR. DEE WILLIS: Okay. 18 MR. DOUG HUSTON: Yeah. Well, 19 I want to deal with the trust issue first. I 20 think, and Maryann, you can report this back to 21 Mike, I think that one major way that we can 22 rebuild trust between the citizens of the 23 Northwest and the Department of Energy is to 24 involve all the citizens of the Northwest in a 25 144

1	meaningful way in the decisions made at
2	Hanford.
3	And speaking as a member of the
4	state of Oregon, we would certainly like to be
5	a full partner in the clean up agreements
6	associated with Hanford.
7	MR. GERRY POLLET: I thought
8	you were going to say also have a decent
9	comment period.
10	MR. DOUG HUSTON: Yeah, that's
11	true too. Yeah.
12	MR. GERRY POLLET: Advisory
13	Board comment?
14	MS. PAIGE KNIGHT: Yeah. I,
15	frankly, at this particular moment in time
16	don't know if it is possible to build trust
17	between the public and the Department of
18	Energy.
19	And this is the first time that I
20	have felt this kind of hopelessness on this
21	particular issue.
22	But who I trust is the public. And
23	I think that our obligation is to get more
24	people educated. Without more people involved
25	in knowing what Hanford is and what's going on
19	
	145
	(541) 276-9491 BRIDGES & ASSOCIATES (800) 358-2345

there --1 And I'm thinking of the Port of 2 Portland, I'm thinking of the big businessmen, 3 I'm thinking of the barge companies, et cetera, 4 5 et cetera. I think we have to start building 6 trust among ourselves. And I think then we put 7 8 the pressure on the Department of Energy. I think that we support the 9 Department of Ecology when it takes the steps 10 that it's had to take lately. It's been many a 11 year coming to this. 12 But, you know, I guess there's -- it 13 happens when it happens, and it's happened. I 14 think some people are believing that the 15 Washington Department of Ecology has to back 16 down a little bit and find some ways to 17 compromise with the Department of Energy. 18 19 I would say, no, as long as Ecology makes sure their ego isn't involved in this. I 20 was telling the reporter tonight, I think that 21 there is a little bit of ego both on the 22 23 Department of Energy and on the Washington Department of Ecology. But I think Ecology's 24 25 in the right position. 146

7.	
1	And we need to thank Ecology for
2	making this move in order to support them,
3	because they're sticking their necks out on the
4	line.
5	So you build their trust, you build
6	trust this way. And, you know, I don't see how
7	one can build trust with the machine of the
8	Department of Energy at this point.
9	I actually I don't know if you
10	can even attempt to answer that, Mike. I mean,
11	you're in a very different position. This
12	probably is off limits for you, right?
13	How do we regain our trust together?
14	And it's not you personally.
15	MR. MICHAEL COLLINS: I
16	understand. I can't answer the question. I
17	can only answer for myself.
18	And myopic Mike thinks you trust
19	people, and you just have to go one step at a
20	time to trust individuals. And just keep
21	building up that network.
22	MS. PAIGE KNIGHT: Well, you
23	know, as much time as some of us spend up at
2 4	Hanford, I'm always looking for who can I
25	trust.
	. 147
	(541) 276-9491 BRIDGES & ASSOCIATES (800) 358-2345

1	And the newer people that have been
2	brought in, I can't trust. And I know better
3	than to trust, and I trust my gut pretty much
4	after all these years of living.
5	So I'm a little floored there. So I
6	look for some of the so-called underlings. And
7	I try to I certainly find some people to
8	trust, but they have very little power in the
9	system.
10	MR. DEE WILLIS: Panel, any
11	others? This gentleman over here and then
12	we'll go to the lady.
13	MR PAUL MCADAMS: The lady
14	first.
15	MS. CHERIE HOLENSTEIN: Ladies
16	first. Oh, trust. Cherie Holenstein. I don't
17	know how I can trust anybody in the Department
18	of Energy. The citizens have asked for clean
19	up. Clean up. No more waste.
20	As I said earlier, it's iterated, it
21	reiterated: Clean up, no more waste. And what
22	are we talking about tonight?
23	Importing more waste to Hanford when
24	we have not cleaned up the mess we have. It is
25	that simple.
	148
	(541) 276 0401 PRIDGES (ASSOCIATES (800) 359-2345

1	Enlighten me. What am I missing
2	here?
3	MR. DEE WILLIS: The gentleman
4	in the baseball cap.
5	MS. CHERIE HOLENSTEIN: Please,
6	please.
7	MR. DEE WILLIS: Was that a
8	rhetorical question?
9	MS. CHERIE HOLENSTEIN: No,
10	it's not.
11	MR. DEE WILLIS: Any responses,
12	panel?
13	MR. GERRY POLLET: I'd say
14	she's got it.
15	MR. DOUG HUSTON: I guess I
16	don't understand what the question is.
17	MS. CHERIE HOLENSTEIN: Do you
18	want me to repeat it?
19	MR. DOUG HUSTON: No. No. No.
20	No. I heard the question. Actually, I guess I
21	don't have a good answer for that. Mike?
22	MR. GERRY POLLET: You know,
23	let me answer this question. It is also
24	related to this.
25	A number of members of Congress have
	149
	(541) 276-9491 BRIDGES & ASSOCIATES (800) 358-2345

1	all said the same thing you've just said.
2	Write them and ask them to act.
3	They've, you know there are
4	statements in the back of the room here from
5	Senator Wyden, Senator Smith, Congressman Wu,
6	last year, Congressman Blumenauer's statement,
7	Brian Beard's statement all saying the same
8	thing: Clean up, don't add more. It makes no
9	sense to anyone.
10	And all this talk about, you know,
11	is the EIS adequate about this, that, or the
12	other thing, hides the fundamental question,
13	is: Is it wrong to be doing this?
14	MR. DEE WILLIS: Okay, Nancy.
15	MS. NANCY METRICK: Well, he
16	actually answered it.
17	MR. DEE WILLIS: Sir?
18	MR. PAUL MCADAMS: Paul
19	McAdams. What isotopes will be buried in those
20	trenches? I mean, what type of radioactive
21	material, what are the radionuclides?
22	MR. MICHAEL COLLINS: You could
23	go through the table of radionuclides and pick
24	out most of them.
25	MR. PAUL MCADAMS: I mean, what
	150
	(541) 276-9491 BRIDGES & ASSOCIATES (800) 358-2345

1	is some of most of the
2	MR. MICHAEL COLLINS: The most
3	radioactive ones and the ones that end up
4	contributing most to, at least short-term
5	impacts, are cesium and strontiums of the
6	world.
7	MR. PAUL MCADAMS: Strontium
8	90?
9	MR. MICHAEL COLLINS: Strontium
10	90 and cesium 137, I believe it is.
11	Long term, the impacts end up being
12	the uraniums, the
13	MR. GERRY POLLET: Technetiums.
14	MR. MICHAEL COLLINS:
15	Technetiums, thank you. Sometimes Carbon 14.
16	Those type of things. And those long terms are
17	the ones we consider relatively long lived.
18	MR. DEE WILLIS: Other
19	questions, comments?
20	MR. MICHAEL COLLINS: Yeah,
21	Iodine 129's another one.
22	MS. JOYCE FOUINGSTED: I'd like
23	to know what the treatment process is going to
24	be
25	MR. DEE WILLIS: Joyce
	151
	(541) 276-9491 BRIDGES & ASSOCIATES (800) 358-2345

1	Fouingsted.
2	MS. JOYCE FOUINGSTED: I'm
3	Joyce Fouingsted.
4	What is the treatment process for
5	the transuranic waste? Will there be any
6	plutonium put into these trenches? If so, why?
7	MR. MICHAEL COLLINS: You can't
8	say no atom of plutonium will get into these
9	trenches. The treatment process is generally,
10	get rid of the chemical constituents in it,
11	that could be by neutralization or lots of
12	other processes.
13	And then for the radioactive
14	portion, there's really only two treatments:
15	One is, in some cases, you can put it back
16	through a reactor, which isn't very popular;
17	or, two, time. Those are the two treatments
18	for radioactivity.
19	So for radioactivity, you contain
20	it. And I think Mr. Carpenter said that very
21	well earlier.
22	MS. JOYCE FOUINGSTED: Where
23	are the monitors going to be placed under the
24	trenches?
25	MR. MICHAEL COLLINS: In lined
	152
	(541) 276-9491 BRIDGES & ASSOCIATES (800) 358-2345

1	trenches for the lined trenches, what will
2	happen is there will be sensors between the two
3	plastic liners, and then there will be some set
4	of groundwater monitoring wells around it.
5	MS. JOYCE FOUINGSTED: And are
6	there going to be monitors underneath these
. 7	trenches?
8	MR. MICHAEL COLLINS: I don't
9	know that.
10	MS. JOYCE FOUINGSTED: Before
11	things get to the groundwater?
12	MR. GERRY POLLET: That's
13	actually, in history, I just wrote up in there
14	groundwater monitoring strategy.
15	The law requires an early detection
16	system to its soil column. And DOE has no
17	plans for obviously, there's none at the
18	existing unlined burial grounds and there's no
19	plan for it in the new facilities either.
20	MS. JOYCE FOUINGSTED: So I'd
21	have to agree with you, then, it's not a legal
22	document.
23	MS. PAIGE KNIGHT: Well, can I
24	also answer your question, Joyce?
25	MS. JOYCE FOUINGSTED: Uh-huh.
	153
	133
	(541) 276-9491 BRIDGES & ASSOCIATES (800) 358-2345

Panel Discussion (contd); TPO-0027

	1	MS. PAIGE KNIGHT: There aren't
	2	going to be any monitoring things, they're
	3	aren't going to be any of the things you're
	4	asking about, because we're not going to let
	5	this happen. That's the answer.
	6	TPO-0027 MS. JOYCE FOUINGSTED: Thank
	7	you. One last question. We have planes going
	8	into buildings; we have, in other countries,
	9	cars and trucks going into various compounds,
	10	buildings, and so forth, blowing things up, so
	11	have they looked at one of the drivers running
	12	this truck loaded with all these goodies into
	13	some major, you know, like, pick it, the
	14	federal building downtown, whatever?
1	15	MR. MICHAEL COLLINS: Not a
	16	there's been no specific accident onsite
	17	analyzed for a truck loaded with anything
	18	crashing
	19	Well, that's not true. Some of our
	20	accident analysis do include just our normal
	21	a truck just normally operating, accidentally
28	22	crashing into places and starting a fire, an
	23	explosion, and that sort of thing.
	24	We don't look at anything like a
	25	federal building, which is outside the

154